

Heavy Quark Phenomenology from Lattice QCD

Damir Becirevic^{a *}

^aDip. di Fisica, Università “La Sapienza” and INFN, Piazzale Aldo Moro 2, I-00185 Rome, Italy

Recent results relevant for the B -physics phenomenology, obtained from lattice QCD simulations by the APE Collaboration, are reviewed. This includes the $B^0 - \bar{B}^0$ mixing amplitude, $B \rightarrow \pi$ semileptonic decay and the relative width difference of B_s^0 mesons, $(\Delta\Gamma/\Gamma)_{B_s}$.

The main theoretical obstacles in determining the amount of CP-violation that comes from the Standard Model (SM) are related to the uncertainties in computation of various hadronic quantities. In this talk, I focus on several such quantities/processes involving heavy-light mesons, for which APE group provided new lattice results. Technical details about the simulations are given in the references which will be quoted with each quantity I discuss in this paper. Here I only stress that all our results are obtained at $\beta = 6.2$, in the quenched approximation, and by using the (fully propagating) $\mathcal{O}(a)$ improved, Wilson fermions.

1. Decay Constants (f_B and others) [1, 2]

One of the essential hadronic quantities entering the $B_q^0 - \bar{B}_q^0$ mixing amplitude is the B -meson decay constant f_{B_q} ($q = d, s$), defined as

$$\langle 0 | \bar{b} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 q | B_q(p) \rangle = i p_\mu f_{B_q} . \quad (1)$$

The central results from our two simulations (see Tab. 1) are obtained by: (i) linearly extrapolating (interpolating) $f_{H_q} \sqrt{m_{H_q}}$ in $1/m_{H_q}$, to the B (D) meson mass; (ii) including the KLM factor in a way discussed in [3]; (iii) converting to the physical units by using $a^{-1}(m_{K^*}) = 2.7(1)$ GeV. To estimate the systematic errors, we combine in quadrature the following differences between our central values and the ones obtained when: (a) extrapolating in $1/m_{H_q}$ quadratically; (b) omitting the KLM factor, (c) using the ratio f_H/f_π to extrapolate to m_B . Since the extrapolation from the directly accessed heavy meson masses ($2 \text{ GeV} \leq m_H \leq 3 \text{ GeV}$) to m_B is rather long,

*Talk given at “Lattice 2000”, Bangalore, India. Based on works done with A. Abada, Ph.Boucaud, V.Giménez, L.Giusti, J.P.Leroy, V.Lubicz, G.Martinelli, D.Meloni, F.Mescia and A. Retico.

the source (a) largely dominates the systematics. This error has not been included in the results [2], where only 3 heavy quarks were considered. Note, however, that this error completely cancels in the SU(3) breaking ratio, f_{B_s}/f_{B_d} . For comparison with results of other lattice groups, see [4]. In [

Table 1

Results for pseudoscalar decay constants in MeV. First errors are statistical and the second are systematic.

	Ref. [1]	Ref. [2]
f_B	$173(13)_{-3}^{+26}$	$175(22)_{-0}^{+8}$
f_{B_s}/f_B	$1.14(2)(1)$	$1.17(4)(1)$
f_D	$216(11)(5)$	$207(11)_{-0}^{+4}$
f_{D_s}/f_D	$1.11(1)(1)$	$1.13(3)(1)$

3] we have also computed the vector meson decay constants, which I now update. In addition we compute the coupling of the vector meson to the tensor current, *i.e.*

$$\begin{aligned} \langle 0 | \bar{b} \gamma_\mu q | B_q^*(p, \lambda) \rangle &= i e_\mu^{(\lambda)} m_{B_q^*} f_{B_q^*} \\ \langle 0 | \bar{b} \sigma_{\mu\nu} q | B_q^*(p, \lambda) \rangle &= i (e_\mu^{(\lambda)} p_\nu - p_\mu e_\nu^{(\lambda)}) f_{B_q^*}^T(\mu) , \end{aligned}$$

where μ is the scale at which the tensor density is non-perturbatively renormalized (in the RI-MOM scheme). These decay constants are particularly important in testing the validity of the factorization in non-leptonic decays of heavy-light mesons. Our new results are

$$f_{B^*} = 199(14)_{-4}^{+34} \text{ MeV} ; f_{D^*} = 258(14)(6) \text{ MeV} ;$$

$$f_{B_s^*}/f_{B^*} = 1.14(2)(1) ; f_{B^*}^T(m_b)/f_{B^*} = 0.88(2)(2) ;$$

$$f_{D_s^*}/f_{D^*} = 1.10(2) ; f_{D^*}^T(2 \text{ GeV})/f_{D^*} = 0.90(2) .$$

2. $B_q^0\text{--}\bar{B}_q^0$ Mixing and $(\Delta\Gamma/\Gamma)_{B_s}$ [2, 10]

To access any bare continuum $\Delta B = 2$ operator from the lattice, by using Wilson fermions, one first has to subtract the effect of mixing with other dimension-six 4-fermion operators which is due to the explicitly broken chiral symmetry in the Wilson quark action. A bare (continuum) operator should then be appropriately renormalized. The whole procedure can be shortly written as $\langle \bar{B}_q^0 | Q_i(\mu) | B_q^0 \rangle =$

$$\langle \bar{B}_q^0 | \sum_j Z_{ij}(g_0^2, \mu) \left(Q_j^{\text{latt.}} + \sum_{k \neq j} \Delta_k(g_0^2) Q_k^{\text{latt.}} \right) | B_q^0 \rangle,$$

where i, j, k run over the basis of parity conserving operators (Q_i), $\Delta_i(g_0^2)$ and $Z_{ij}(g_0^2, \mu)$ are the subtraction and renormalization (RC) constants, respectively. A technique to compute the constants Δ_i and Z_{ij} non-perturbatively, in the RI-MOM renormalization scheme, has been developed in ref. [5]. We work in Landau gauge, apply the technique [5] at three different values of the scale μ , and verify that the scale dependence of $Z_{ij}(\mu)$, for the operators discussed below, is indeed well described by the perturbative NLO anomalous dimension matrix [6]. This allows us to express our matrix elements in the renormalization group invariant (RGI) form.²

$B_q^0\text{--}\bar{B}_q^0$ Mixing: The needed parameter, $B_{B_q}(q = d, s)$, is defined as

$$\langle \bar{B}_q^0 | Q_L(\mu) | B_q^0 \rangle = \frac{8}{3} m_{B_q}^2 f_{B_q}^2 B_{B_q}(\mu), \quad (2)$$

where $Q_L = \bar{b}^i \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) q^i \bar{b}^j \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) q^j$, and i, j are the color indices. From the definitions (1) and (2), it is clear that the B -parameter can be directly accessed if (for each heavy light-meson H_q) we compute the ratio of correlation functions

$$\frac{(3/8) \cdot \sum_{\vec{x}, \vec{y}} \langle P(x) Q_L(0; \mu) P^\dagger(y) \rangle}{\sum_{\vec{x}} \langle P(x) A_0^\dagger(0) \rangle \sum_{\vec{y}} \langle A_0(0) P^\dagger(y) \rangle} \xrightarrow{-t_x, t_y \gg 0} B_{H_q}(\mu). \quad (3)$$

The last limit is valid when the operator Q_L and the pseudoscalar sources P are sufficiently separated on the temporal axis. To reach the physically relevant B_{B_q} from the extracted B_{H_q} (which

² The procedure sketched above can be highly simplified if one uses the Ward identity to relate the parity conserving to the parity violating operators (for which $\Delta_i = 0$) [7]. This idea is yet to be implemented in practice.

should scale with heavy meson mass as a constant), we make the linear $1/m_H$ fit and extrapolate to m_B . Our final results are

$$\hat{B}_{B_d} = 1.38(11)_{-0.09}^{+0.00}, \quad \hat{B}_{B_s} = 1.35(5)_{-0.08}^{+0.00}, \\ \hat{B}_{B_s}/\hat{B}_{B_d} = 0.98(5), \quad (4)$$

where we converted (to NLO) the directly computed $B_{B_q}^{\text{RI-MOM}}(\mu)$ to the RGI form $\hat{B}_{B_q}$. We also obtained, $\hat{B}_D = 1.24(4)_{-0.09}^{+0.00}$, which may be useful in the non-SM phenomenology. Since we clearly see $1/m_H^{(n)}$ corrections from our data, one can try to constrain the extrapolation by using the static result for $\hat{B}_B$ [8]. Such an exercise leads to a $\sim 5\%$ lower value of $\hat{B}_B$, which is well within our error bars (a similar conclusion is reached in [4]).

After combining the above results with the ones for f_{B_q} , also computed in [2], we get

$$f_{B_d} \sqrt{\hat{B}_{B_d}} = 206(28)(7) \text{ MeV}; \\ \xi \equiv \frac{f_{B_s}}{f_{B_d}} \sqrt{\frac{\hat{B}_{B_s}}{\hat{B}_{B_d}}} = 1.16(7). \quad (5)$$

In the last result, most of the systematic uncertainties cancel in the ratio. To exemplify the phenomenological benefit of this result, I combine our value for ξ with the updated experimental value for the frequency of B_d^0 mesons oscillations ($\Delta m_d^{(\text{exp.})} = 0.486(15) \text{ ps}^{-1}$ [9]), to get

$$\Delta m_s = \frac{|V_{ts}|^2}{|V_{td}|^2} \xi^2 \left(\frac{m_{B_s}}{m_{B_d}} \Delta m_d \right)^{(\text{exp.})} \\ = 16.2 \pm 2.1 \pm 3.4 \text{ ps}^{-1}, \quad (6)$$

where $|V_{ts}|^2/|V_{td}|^2 = 24.4 \pm 5.0$ is assumed. Experimental lower bound is $\Delta m_s^{(\text{exp.})} > 14.9 \text{ ps}^{-1}$ [9]. $(\Delta\Gamma/\Gamma)_{B_s}$: In the framework of the heavy quark expansion, the leading contribution in the expression for the width difference of B_s^0 mesons, comes from $\Delta B = 2$ operator, $Q_S = \bar{b}^i (1 - \gamma_5) s^i \bar{b}^j (1 - \gamma_5) s^j$, the matrix element of which is parameterized as

$$\langle \bar{B}_s^0 | Q_S(\mu) | B_s^0 \rangle = -\frac{5}{3} \left(\frac{m_{B_s}^2 f_{B_s}}{m_b(\mu) + m_s(\mu)} \right)^2 B_S(\mu) \quad (7)$$

where $B_S(\mu)$ is the wanted bag parameter. An important observation made in ref. [10] is that if we only replace $O_L/8 \rightarrow -O_S/5$ in eq. (3), we see a very large dependence on the inverse heavy meson

mass $1/m_{H_s}$. On the contrary, if in denominator of eq. (3) we also replace the axial current by the pseudoscalar density, $A_0 \rightarrow P$, the $1/m_{H_s}$ dependence becomes much weaker and the extrapolation to m_B is more under control (which is why our central results are those obtained using the latter procedure). Obviously, the large $1/m_H$ dependence comes from the ratio of the heavy meson/heavy quark mass, $[m_{H_s}/(m_Q + m_s)]^2$. It will be interesting to see whether the inconsistency of the two procedures disappears with the simulations performed closer to m_{B_s} . In this calculation, we also needed to compute the matrix element of the operator $\tilde{Q}_S$ which is the one obtained by reversing the color indices in Q_S , and which mix with Q_S in the continuum. Once we extract the values for $B_S(\mu)$ and $\tilde{B}_S(\mu)$, we converted RI-MOM $\rightarrow$ $\overline{\text{MS}}$ since the Wilson coefficients, $G(z)$ and $G_S(z)$ ($z = m_c^2/m_b^2$), were computed in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme [11]. After a linear extrapolation to $1/m_{B_s}$, we get

$$B_S^{\overline{\text{MS}}}(m_b) = 0.86(2)(3); \quad \tilde{B}_S^{\overline{\text{MS}}}(m_b) = 1.25(3)_{-0.05}^{+0.02}.$$

For the physical prediction of $(\Delta\Gamma/\Gamma)_{B_s}$, one needs the ratio of the matrix elements (2) and (7). We obtain

$$\mathcal{R}^{\overline{\text{MS}}}(\mu = m_b) = -0.93(3)(1) \quad (8)$$

which is in a good agreement with results obtained by using the effective theories [8, 12]. We proposed in [10] a safer way to predict

$$\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{\Gamma}\right)_{B_s} = K \left(\tau_{B_s} \Delta m_{B_d} \frac{m_{B_s}}{m_{B_d}} \right)^{(\text{exp.})} \times \left(G(z) - G_S(z) \mathcal{R}(m_b) + \tilde{\delta}_{1/m} \right) \xi^2 \quad (9)$$

where K is the known constant and $\tilde{\delta}_{1/m}$ encodes $1/m_b$ corrections (which are estimated by using the vacuum saturation approximation). The advantage of using this formula is that it contains experimentally well determined quantities, and ξ and $\mathcal{R}(m_b)$ ratios, in which (again) most of the systematic uncertainties cancel. Finally, we obtained

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{\Gamma}\right)_{B_s} &= [(0.5 \pm 0.1) - (13.8 \pm 2.8) \mathcal{R}(m_b) \\ &\quad + (15.7 \pm 2.8) \tilde{\delta}_{1/m}] \cdot 10^{-2} \\ &= (4.7 \pm 1.5 \pm 1.6) \cdot 10^{-2}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where we show how the explicit cancellation occurs between the leading $\mathcal{R}(m_b)$ and the $1/m_b$ correcting terms. Therefore, to improve the above result it is necessary to gain a better control over the dimension-seven operators which appear in $\tilde{\delta}_{1/m}$.

3. $|V_{ub}|$ from $B(B \rightarrow \pi \ell \nu)$ [13]

Compared to “Lattice 99” [1], we now have the *final* results for the D decay modes (see [13]), and also for the most challenging one, $B \rightarrow \pi$. The relevant form factors, $F_{+0}(q^2)$ ($q = p_H - p$),

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \pi(p) | \bar{q} \gamma_\mu Q | H(p_H) \rangle &= \frac{m_H^2 - m_\pi^2}{q^2} q_\mu F_0(q^2) + \\ &\quad \left(p_H + p - q \frac{m_H^2 - m_\pi^2}{q^2} \right)_\mu F_+(q^2), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

are extracted for 3 different light (q) and 4 heavy (Q) quark masses and for 13 inequivalent kinematical configurations $(\vec{p}_H, \vec{q})$. The mass extrapolations of form factors are known to be trickier because of the interplay between m_H and q^2 dependences. A parameterization for the q^2 -dependence, which contains most of the theoretically available constraints, has been proposed in [14]:

$$F_+(q^2) = \frac{c_H(1 - \alpha_H)}{(1 - \tilde{q}^2)(1 - \alpha_H \tilde{q}^2)},$$

$$F_0(q^2) = \frac{c_H(1 - \alpha_H)}{(1 - \tilde{q}^2/\beta_H)}, \quad (12)$$

where $\tilde{q}^2 = q^2/m_{B^*}^2$. The parameters $\phi \in \{c_H \sqrt{m_H}, (1 - \alpha_H)m_H, (\beta - 1)m_H\}$ should scale as a constant (plus corrections $\propto 1/m_H$). To reach $B \rightarrow \pi$ we first fit the form factors to the parameterization (12) for each combination of the heavy and light quarks and then adopted the following two methods:

Method I We smoothly extrapolate to the final pion (kaon) state, for every heavy quark, and then use the scaling laws for all three parameters to extrapolate to B , namely

$$\phi = a_0 + \frac{a_1}{m_H} + \frac{a_2}{m_H^2}. \quad (13)$$

Method II Following the proposal of UKQCD group [15], we first extrapolate to the final pion at fixed

$$v \cdot p = \frac{M_{H_d}^2 + M_\pi^2 - q^2}{2M_{H_d}}, \quad (14)$$

Table 2

APE lattice results for the $B \rightarrow \pi$ form factors [13] are compared to the predictions obtained by using LCSR [16].

	<i>Method I</i>	<i>Method II</i>	<i>LCSR</i> [16]
c_B	0.42(13)(4)	0.51(8)(1)	0.41(12)
α_B	0.40(15)(9)	0.45(17) $^{+.06}_{-.13}$	0.32 $^{+.21}_{-.07}$
β_B	1.22(14) $^{+.12}_{-.03}$	1.20(13) $^{+.15}_{-.00}$	—
$F(0)$	0.26(5)(4)	0.28(6)(5)	0.28(5)
$F^{B \rightarrow K}(0)/F^{B \rightarrow \pi}(0)$	1.21(9) $^{+.00}_{-.09}$	1.19(11) $^{+.03}_{-.11}$	1.28(11) $^{+.18}_{-.10}$
$F_0(m_B^2)$	1.3(6) $^{+.0}_{-.4}$	1.5(5) $^{+.0}_{-.4}$	—
$g_{B^* B \pi}$	20 ± 7	24 ± 6	22 ± 7
$ V_{ub} ^{-2} \Gamma(B^0 \rightarrow \pi^- \ell^+ \nu)$ [ps $^{-1}$]	$6.3 \pm 2.4 \pm 1.6$	$8.5 \pm 3.8 \pm 2.2$	7.3 ± 2.5

and then extrapolate to B by using the HQET scaling laws. The q^2 -behavior is then fit by using eq. (12).

The results obtained by using both methods are shown in Tab. 2, where we also make a comparison with the light cone QCD sum rules (LCSR) predictions [16]. Besides a very good consistency of the results of the two (different) methods, a pleasant feature of this analysis is also the agreement with lattice results of [15] as well as with the LCSR results [16]. For a further comparison with presently available lattice results, see [4].

The central values in Tab. 2 are obtained through a quadratic extrapolation to m_B , which provides a better consistency with the Callan-Treiman relation, $F_0(m_B^2) = f_B/f_\pi$.³ The complete account of the systematic uncertainties is detailed in [13]. I emphasize that $F^{B \rightarrow \pi}(0)$ in Tab. 2, as obtained after extrapolating $F^{H \rightarrow \pi}(0)m_H^{3/2}$ to m_B , is indistinguishable from the one obtained by combining separately extrapolated c_B and α_B into $F^{B \rightarrow \pi}(0) = c_B(1 - \alpha_B)$.

To read the content of the parameterization (12) I recall that the parameter c_B measures the residue of $F_+(q^2)$ at $m_{B^*}^2$, thus allowing determination of the $g_{B^* B \pi}$. By using the standard definitions, one has $g_{B^* B \pi} = 2m_{B^*}c_B/f_{B^*}$ and the results are also given in Tab. 2. The parameter α_B indicates that besides the first pole ($q^2 = m_{B^*}^2$), all

the other singularities contributing to $F_+(q^2)$ can be mimicked by an effective pole corresponding to $m_{1-} \simeq 8 \pm 1$ GeV, whereas the contributions to the scalar form factor $F_0(q^2)$ are represented by an effective pole with the mass $m_{0+} \simeq 6 \pm 3$ GeV.

Finally, by comparing our results for the decay width, with the experimental branching ratio $B(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \ell^- \bar{\nu})$, we obtain $|V_{ub}| = (4.1 \pm 1.1)10^{-3}$.

REFERENCES

1. A. Abada *et al.*, [hep-lat/9910021].
2. D. Becirevic *et al.*, [hep-lat/0002025].
3. D. Becirevic *et al.*, [hep-lat/9811003].
4. C. Bernard, [hep-lat/0011064].
5. A. Donini *et al.*, [hep-lat/9902030].
6. M. Ciuchini *et al.*, [hep-ph/9711402];
A. J. Buras *et al.*, [hep-ph/0005183].
7. D. Becirevic *et al.*, [hep-lat/0005013].
8. V. Giménez, J. Reyes, [hep-lat/0010048].
9. A. Stocchi, [hep-ph/0010222].
10. D. Becirevic *et al.*, [hep-ph/0006135].
11. M. Beneke *et al.*, [hep-ph/9808385].
12. S. Hashimoto, *et al.*, [hep-lat/0004022].
13. A. Abada *et al.*, [hep-lat/0011065].
14. D. Becirevic, A. Kaidalov, [hep-ph/9904490].
15. K. C. Bowler *et al.*, [hep-lat/9911011].
16. A. Khodjamirian *et al.*, [hep-ph/0001297].
17. S. Aoki *et al.*, [hep-lat/0011008];
C. Maynard, [hep-lat/0010016].

³ Research on verification of this relation on the lattice has been discussed at this conference [17].